

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of January 7, 2008 in which the Examiner made certain objections to the specification and drawings. The amendments to the specification add appropriate headings as required by the Examiner. A substitute specification accompanies this communication incorporating the amendments. In Fig. 1, the reference numeral 34 has been inserted. Fig. 8 is labeled "prior art". The amendments to the specification and drawing are believed to address each of the Examiner's objections.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 as allegedly anticipated over Jones et al. Claims 4-12 and 14 are rejected as unpatentable over Jones et al. Claim 13 is rejected over Jones in view of Meshberg.

The examiner's rejection of the claims is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

As to the rejection of claims 1-3, Jones does not anticipate the claims. The Examiner has identified first and second valve members 22, 20 and 32, 34 respectively. Applicant asserts that the first valve member is actually element 24. However, applicant believes that the Examiner has incorrectly suggested that the second valve member is moveable into a metering position in which it actuates the opening of the first valve member.

According to the description beginning on page 12, line 5 of Jones, the valve members 24, 34 are moveable by appropriate movement of the magnetic ring 40 and the first valve member is not moved by the second valve member. In this connection, some of the important considerations in the design according to claim 1 are discussed in the introduction specification and in the advantages set forth following the statements of the invention.

The most significant point emphasized by the applicant is that the the second valve does not move into a metering position in which it actuates the opening in the first valve as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner's rejection of the dependent claims likewise rely on Jones. However, it is believed that because Jones does not anticipate independent claim 1, a rejection based on obviousness is not proper.

In connection with method claim 13, Jones does not show a valve mechanism under claim 1. In addition, the Meshberg does not teach a metering chamber. Thus, it is not clear how the Examiner can suggest that the method of Meshberg could be used with the device of Jones to form a metering chamber given that it is believed not possible to modify Jones so that it could employ the method of Meshberg.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection, and allow the claims.

If additional fees are required, the Director is authorized to charge deposit account 504147 or credit any overpayment thereto.

Respectfully submitted,

/JOHN P. DELUCA/

John P. DeLuca
Registration No. 25,505
Attorney for Applicant

November 27, 2007
CUSTOMER NUMBER 68804

John P. De Luca
17420 Ryefield Ct.
Dickerson, MD 20842
301 349 2899
jpd@jpdip.net